



King's Research Portal

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Nowosiad, A. (2018). "Un maravilloso tapiz": Luis de Aranda, the Renaissance Glosa, and its Readers. *Hispanic Review*, 86(1), 45-68. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/685769>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



PROJECT MUSE®

"Un maravilloso tapiz": Luis de Aranda, the Renaissance
Glosa, and Its Readers

Alexandra Nowosiad

Hispanic Review, Volume 86, Number 1, Winter 2018, pp. 45-68 (Article)



Published by University of Pennsylvania Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/hir.2018.0002>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/685769>



“UN MARAVILLOSO TAPIZ”: LUIS DE
ARANDA, THE RENAISSANCE *GLOSA*,
AND ITS READERS

Alexandra Nowosiad

King's College London

ABSTRACT The verse *glosa* emerged in sixteenth-century Spain as an important means of shaping the Renaissance reception of late medieval poetry, with the composition and publication of *glosas* on ballads and *cancionero* verse. Building on recent scholarship, which has increasingly considered the verse *glosa* as an intertextual process, this article seeks to sketch out further lines of inquiry into the form's relationship with early modern concepts of authorship and poetic creativity. An examination of the Renaissance glosses composed by Luis de Aranda on key works of *cancionero* verse, along with their print and manuscript transmission, reveals that the *glosa* was understood as an authorial, and marketable, print product, as well as a creative, and often ambiguous, process through which the medieval poets of the past were canonized and the glossator might fashion himself as an author. The article concludes by considering how contemporary readers may have engaged with the *glosa*.

“Dos personas, pues, por lo menos, apadrinan toda glosa. El autor de la glosa, por así decirlo, recoge de manos de otro poeta el hilo espiritual, tejiendo luego con éste su propia inspiración el complejo de la glosa” (Janner, “La glosa española” 186). What Hans Janner alludes to here is the process of intertextuality that is so particular to the Renaissance *glosa*. This

This work was supported by the Arts & Humanities Research Council (Grant number AH/K503071/1).

poetic form allows one poet to expand on the verses of another while retaining the metrical scheme of the original; *texto* and *glosa* are interwoven to produce a new, symbiotic text. Janner's observations on the *glosa* anticipate the greater focus on intertextuality by more recent scholars of the form. Giuliana Piacentini and Blanca Perinán state in the introduction to their edition of sixteenth-century *glosas* on traditional ballads that this form is "uno de los fenómenos de intertextualidad más peculiar de la poesía hispánica" (10). Emma Scoles and Ines Ravasini examine the relationship between the intertextuality of the *glosa* and its exegetical functions. Eva Belén Carro Carbajal's paper on Luis de Aranda's *Glosa peregrina* also draws out the importance of intertextuality in the *glosa* as it relates to the interaction between poetry transmitted in oral and book cultures in the early modern period. Most recently, Isabella Tomassetti has situated the *glosa* in the context of the intertextual literary culture of fifteenth-century courtly verse (*Cantaré*). These studies, like Janner's work on the *glosa*, conceive of the literary text as open, rather than closed, to subsequent rewritings and reinterpretations.

This line of research is addressed more broadly in the SEMYR volume in which Carro Carbajal's paper appears: *El texto infinito: tradición y reescritura en la Edad Media y el Renacimiento*. All the studies in this volume recognize that the medieval and early modern text generates new texts. Mary Carruthers argued this point in her study *The Book of Memory*, observing that "adaptation, the essential conduit of *memoria ad res*, lies at the very basis of medieval literary activity" (259). Julian Weiss has extended Carruthers's arguments to the literary milieu of late medieval and early modern Spain, in which "reading, memory, and composition are part of a creative continuum" that produces new meanings and texts beyond the original author's control ("Memory in Creation" 151). As this brief survey suggests, recent research on the intertextuality of the *glosa* has moved away from a view of these texts as products, which invite a formalist response, and towards an understanding of them as a *process*. There is, however, more to be said about the ways in which early modern understandings of the *glosa* as product on the one hand and productive process on the other interacted with each other, particularly in the light of recent work that has been done on early modern authorship, the book, and reading practices. This article seeks to outline some possible avenues in this line of research.

Little has been said about the implications of the intertextuality of this form for early modern understandings of authorship and poetic creativity,

particularly in the context of early print culture. This article asks what the work of one sixteenth-century glossator, the relatively little-studied Luis de Aranda, can tell us about the ways in which the *glosa* interacted with these early modern concepts and with contemporary reading practices. By examining Aranda's *glosas* on the medieval *cancionero* poets Juan de Mena, Íñigo López de Mendoza and Jorge Manrique, this article aims to show that the sixteenth-century Spanish *glosa* is, in fact, a useful “workshop” for thinking about authorship and the creativity of poets and their readers, precisely because of its intertextual process.

I will limit my discussion here to the use of the *glosa* in a specific context: that of sixteenth-century glossators who chose to rewrite canonical works of fifteenth-century *cancionero* verse for a Renaissance audience. The *glosa*, which had flourished in the *cancionero* poetry of the preceding century, and featured prominently in the 1511 *Cancionero general*, emerged in Spain as an important means of shaping the Renaissance reception of late medieval poetry, with the composition and publication of glosses on ballads as well as *cancionero* verse.¹ Among the *cancionero* verse that was glossed, Jorge Manrique's *Coplas a la muerte de su padre* (c. 1477) were notably glossed twelve times by eleven different Renaissance poets between 1501, when the first *glosa*, by Alonso de Cervantes, appeared in print, and over a century later: the last, anonymous, *glosa* exists in a mid-seventeenth-century manuscript held at the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid.² Of Manrique's eleven Renaissance glossators, Luis de Aranda comments most explicitly and self-consciously on what it means to be a glossator, particularly in an evolving culture of print. For this reason, I will focus my discussion here on his writings.

Through his editorial output, Aranda fashioned his authorial identity as a glossator and mediator between the Renaissance reader and the late medieval

1. For the history and development of the Renaissance *glosa*, see Janner (“La glosa española”) and Tomassetti (“La glosa”; *Cantaré* 163–303). José Labrador Herraiz and Ralph DiFranco have highlighted the importance of the *glosa* in the sixteenth-century reception of fifteenth-century verse. Piacentini and Perinán have documented the popularity of the sixteenth-century *glosa* on the traditional Spanish ballad, while the bibliographical work of Antonio Pérez Gómez on the *glosas* on Manrique's *Coplas* offers insight into the popularity of the Renaissance *glosa* on *cancionero* poetry. I am currently preparing a study on sixteenth-century printed *glosas* on fifteenth-century *cancionero* verse.

2. The shelf mark of this manuscript is MSS/4052. See Nellie Sánchez Arce and Nancy Marino (34–62) for studies of the *glosas* on Manrique. Pérez Gómez provides a catalogue of Renaissance editions of these *glosas*, as well as facsimile reproductions of selected editions.

authoritative poet. His prose commentary on Manrique's *Coplas*, entitled the *Glosa de Moral sentido en prosa. A las famosas, y muy excelentes coplas de don Jorge Manrique*, was printed in quarto format in 1552 in Valladolid by Francisco Fernández de Córdoba. Around 1556 his *Glosa peregrina*, a collection of glossed ballads on religious themes, appeared; this had at least three subsequent editions.³ Finally, in 1575, his verse *glosas* on Santillana's *Proverbios* and Juan de Mena's *Trescientas* were published together in an *octavo* volume in Granada by Hugo de Mena. These last *glosas* were collectively entitled the *Glosa intitulada segunda de moral sentido, à diferencia de otra deste nombre*, a title which, by the design of either Aranda or his printer, positions this book as a sequel, a second part, to Aranda's earlier literary rewriting of a medieval classic, his commentary on Manrique's *Coplas*.⁴ This title invites Renaissance readers, and also modern scholars, to consider the two *glosas* together; they reference each other, forming an editorial macrotext. What Aranda, or his printer, proposes with this book is a curated reading of the poetry of the past. Renaissance readers will read these vernacular *auctores* of the past *through* the glossator. The prologues and *glosas* in this 1575 edition, in particular, are also as much a commentary on the process of glossing as on fifteenth-century poetry, as this article will show.

Although I focus on questions of authorship and poetic creativity, I will also address another gap in scholarship on the *glosa*: the reception and interpretation of these texts by their readers. In the final section of this article, I consider how Renaissance readers responded to the *glosa*. For the reader is also one of the figures who "apadrinan toda *glosa*" (to return to Janner's words), since s/he continues the interpretive work begun by the glossator. I therefore propose here a material and textual approach to the Renaissance *glosa*, which takes into account the reception, as well as the composition, of these texts. The *glosas* themselves, the prologues and paratexts that accompanied them in manuscript and in print, and their material transmission, can reveal much about how early modern Spanish poets and their readers conceived of the interpretive functions and creative possibilities of the *glosa*. This is especially true of Aranda's writings, which have much to tell us about the ways in which the use of the *glosa* by both poets and readers was shaped by understandings of this form as both *product* and *productive process*.

3. See Carro Carbajal for a study of the *Glosa peregrina*.

4. In the prologue to his 1575 *glosas*, Aranda also refers to a *glosa* that he composed on the work of Garci Sánchez de Badajoz; this has not survived.

The Glosa as Product: Materiality and Market Forces

To understand the Renaissance glossator's notion of his *glosa* as both product and dialogic, intertextual process, let us return to Janner's analogy of the *glosa* as a weaving together of texts: “Así podremos decir también que el glosador —nolens, volens— es tejedor, cuyo brioso lirismo entrelaza ideas, razones y sentimientos de otros hombres con el hilo de su inspiración y de su propia convicción, logrando a veces un maravilloso tapiz de sutilezas poéticas” (“Nuevos criterios” 259). Janner expands here on a metaphor which late medieval and early modern glossators themselves used to conceive of their intertextual labor. Self-conscious sixteenth-century glossator Aranda used this very image to describe his *glosas* on Santillana, Mena, and Manrique in his prologue to the 1575 edition of his *glosas* on the *Proverbios* and the *Trescientas*: “He querido y procurado con mi basto y grossero sayal, guarnescer y adornar el brocado de tres altos” (fol. 35^v).⁵ Aranda's words are an echo of those addressed by Juan del Encina to a friend almost a century earlier, in a poem from his 1496 *Cancionero* that refers to a *glosa* written by Encina on his friend's *villancico*:

De mi grossero sayal
y vuestro fino brocado
hecho un sayo ametalado
ved si parecerá mal. (46–49; see also Janner, “La glosa española” 187)

Though the comparison of the glossator's rough cloth with the fine brocade of the original is a wry humility *topos*—the entire poem is full of irony—the image used by the two poets conveys an understanding of the *glosa* as both a creative, intertextual process (the dialogic weaving together of two poetic voices) and as a *product* (the new work that is produced): “un sayo ametalado,” of which the glossator is author.

Aranda, like many of his fellow glossators, saw the *glosas* he composed as authorial works, and from this perspective at least, considered them products, both literary and material. Aranda's *glosas* and their prologues reveal his concern with how the authorship of these intertextual products might be

5. In my transcriptions of unedited manuscript and printed texts I have expanded contractions and added accents and punctuation for clarity.

constructed by himself and his printers. In his prologues he develops a vocabulary for articulating the relationship between glossing and authorship, while the printed editions of his *glosas* materialize his authorship of these books in other ways, which I shall discuss below. Drawing on both printed and manuscript Renaissance *glosas*, I shall examine the implications of understanding the *glosa* as both creative process and material and literary product for contemporary notions of authorship and the role of the reader.

The ways in which sixteenth-century *glosas* were printed and marketed reflects the increased importance of glosses, commentaries and other hermeneutic aides in textual production since the late Middle Ages, as medieval forms of textual exegesis (commentary, marginalia) evolved into tools for the *production* of new texts and new thought, rather than merely their *reception*. Jesús Rodríguez-Velasco's work on fifteenth-century gloss practices ("La *Bibliotheca*," "La producción del margen") and on thirteenth- and fourteenth-century glosses on law (*Plebeyos márgenes*) has shown how gloss and commentary became increasingly important sites for the intellectual, creative, and ideological work of both scholars and nonprofessional writers, even providing a space from which to challenge authoritative source texts. For Rodríguez-Velasco, the gloss is also a material encounter that takes place as a struggle for the territory of the page: "Es una producción de espacio porque aquellos individuos que buscan crear su presencia en el universo de la esfera intelectual, lo hacen precisamente a través de la colonización y reordenación del espacio del libro" ("La producción del margen" 251). The metaphorical movement of the marginal gloss or commentary from the margins to the center of intellectual discourse was mirrored, argues Rodríguez-Velasco, by the literal, material movement of these hermeneutic aides from the margins to a more central position on the page of the fifteenth-century manuscript ("La *Bibliotheca*"). This movement of the gloss, in both material and intellectual space, produces a dispersion of the authority of the glossed text; the gloss now shares in it.

Rodríguez-Velasco's observations about the *mise-en-page* of late medieval glosses and commentaries can be profitably applied to the sixteenth-century *glosa* on *cancionero* poetry, when thinking about the ways in which the authorship and textual authority of the Renaissance *glosa* was materialized. Renaissance glossators of *cancionero* poetry, too, saw their compositions as a way of sharing in the authority of their literary predecessors. One of Manrique's glossators, Francisco de Guzmán, states in the prologue to his 1548 *glosa*, which he dedicated to Eleanor of Austria, Queen of France, that

in glossing the *Coplas*, he hopes to share in not only the poetic ingenuity of his model, but also his literary *fama*:

Don George querría poderme tornar
a fin que el ingenio que tuvo tuviesse
por que dexar en el mundo pudiesse
renombre tan digno qual él fue a dexar. (fol. Ai^v)

The glossator's challenge to these vernacular *auctores* is materialized in the sixteenth-century editions of *glosas* in ways that parallel Rodríguez-Velasco's account of the movements of manuscript glosses to a more central position on the page. The authority and importance of the Renaissance *glosa* is materialized in its conversion into a book: in sixteenth-century print culture, the *glosa* on works of moral and political *cancionero* verse became increasingly associated with a single, codicological unit. *Glosas*, as well as prose commentaries, on *cancionero* poetry became popular printed books, and in some cases, constant companions of the texts which they glossed.⁶ Manrique's *Coplas*, for example, were often accompanied in print by a *glosa*, and in the process this poem became not just a new text, but also a new book. While some of the *glosas* were printed as part of the glossators' own *cancioneros*, as was the case with those by Gregorio Silvestre (1582) and Jorge de Montemayor (1554), many of them convert Manrique's poem into an "independent" book, transplanting it from the wider textual context of a *cancionero* or the *pliego suelto*, in which it had circulated in unglossed form with either other compositions by Manrique, or other poets.⁷ The 1501 luxury folio edition of Cervantes's *glosa*, which provides plenty of material space and woodcut illustrations for meditative reading; Luis Pérez's 1561 *quarto* volume with Latin *ladillos*, and Luis de Aranda's 1552 ample prose commentary are examples of this. Through them, Manrique's poem stands independently of other poems in his own oeuvre, and from that of other *cancionero* poets, in a new, glossed form. At the same time, the *glosa* is constructed as a literary

6. Over the course of the sixteenth century, Mena's *Laberinto* and Santillana's *Proverbios* were often printed with their glosses by Hernán Núñez and Pero Díaz de Toledo respectively. See Linde Brocato ("Publishing"; "El famosísimo poeta") for the role of glosses in the print and manuscript transmission of the *Laberinto*. María Morrás examines the role of Díaz de Toledo's commentary in the reception of the *Proverbios*.

7. See Pérez Gómez's catalogue of editions for details of these two *cancioneros*; Vicente Beltrán provides a study of the textual transmission of the *Coplas*.

and material product, thus staging the “producción de espacio” that Rodríguez-Velasco describes in other types of glossing (“La producción del margen”).

Alongside its association with a codicological unit, the *glosa* emerged in Renaissance print culture as a commodity; it had value not only as a literary work, but also as a marketable book. Of the ten Renaissance *glosas* on Manrique’s *Coplas*, most were printed in multiple editions over the course of the century, while a few had considerable editorial success. The *glosas* of Cervantes (1501) and Rodrigo de Valdepeñas (c. 1540) had fourteen and twelve sixteenth-century editions respectively. In these editions, the *glosa* takes center stage: Cervantes’s *glosa* was marketed by printers as the “Glosa famosísima sobre las coplas de don Jorge Marrique,” rather than, for example, the “Coplas de Don Jorge Manrique *con glosa*.”⁸ The *glosa* itself was clearly a selling point of these editions of the *Coplas*, which reconfigure the traditional textual hierarchy between gloss and glossed text. In 1551, the Antwerpian printer Martín Nucio, recognized for his shrewdness in catering to the tastes of his market, published an entire volume of glosses (prose commentaries and a verse *glosa*) on late medieval verse: Santillana’s *Proverbios*, Manrique’s *Coplas*, and the anonymous *Coplas de Mingo Revulgo*. This *duodécimo* volume had three subsequent editions in the latter half of the century: 1558, 1581, and 1594, a testament to the popularity and commercial value of these printed glosses. In all these editions, the *glosa*, now often considered a derivative form, becomes a central part of the new editorial entity that has been produced.

Aranda himself was keenly aware of the ways in which the *glosa* was being materialized and marketed as a product by contemporary printers and book-sellers. The 1552 edition of his commentary on the *Coplas* imitates previous editions of other *glosas* on the same text through its dedication to a prominent patron and the use of this dedicatee’s coats of arms on the title page.⁹ We know that Aranda was aware of some of the other *glosas* on the *Coplas*

8. Cf. the title of Hernán Núñez de Toledo’s commentary on Mena’s *Laberinto*, which was marketed by printers of the 1499 edition as “Las. ccc. del famosísimo poeta Juan de Mena con glosa.” See Weiss and Cortijo Ocaña’s critical edition of Núñez’s commentary (*Glosa sobre las “Trezientas”*) for a study of the gloss’s reception, especially pp. 1001–17 for an annotated catalogue of its editions.

9. See Pérez Gómez for facsimile reproductions of a selection of the frontispieces of the printed Renaissance *glosas* on the *Coplas*, and Marino’s monograph on the reception of the *Coplas* for discussion of their effect (80–85).

that had appeared in print in the first half of the sixteenth century, including Cervantes's gloss, as he refers to these in the prologue to his own commentary on the poem, explaining that he chose to gloss it in prose in order to differentiate himself from the verse glossators: “Pues visto que me hurtó la bendición él que se anticipó primero, haziendo lo que yo pensaua hazer, quise dexalle el lugar y no glosalla en metro como otros muchos han hecho, por no acechalle al carcañal” (*Glosa de Moral sentido* fol. 2^v). Further, it seems that Aranda conceived of his *glosas* as printed books, and that he was interested in pursuing a program of printing for these textual adaptations. According to Vicente Miguel Ruiz Fuentes, the glossator left incomplete instructions for the printing of his works after his death in a will, which states: “por quanto yo e tenido por exerçicio escrevir algunas cosas, asi en prosa como en verso, de devoçion e de umanidad; y algunas de ellas an sido impresas . . . y otras están por imprimir e por acabar y otras acabadas” (103). In the same document, referring to his *glosas*, Aranda describes himself as having “fecho e ordenado dos libros” (103), suggesting an awareness of himself as an author of printed books, and of his *glosas* as material, and even commercial, as well as literary, products.

The Glosa as Process: Materializing Authorship, Canonizing Auctores

If Aranda understood his *glosas* as commodities in the book market, as products to be printed, bought, and sold, he was also keenly aware of the multiple processes in which his *glosas* participated, namely the processes by which he as glossator achieved the equivalent status of author through composing and publishing his *glosas* on *cancionero* verse, while his late medieval literary predecessors were canonized as vernacular literary models and authorities. In an essay exploring the many complex ways in which early modern authorship was understood, Roger Chartier discusses the emergence of an association between authorship and the codicological unit, particularly in print culture (24–59), an association which appears to underpin Aranda's concern in his will with the printed transmission of his work, and his description of his *glosas* as “libros.” The 1575 edition of his *glosas* on Mena and Santillana also constructs Aranda as its author through the glossator's self-reflexive prologues to each work, which serve as the unifying thread of the volume.

Aranda's authorial status is also the structuring principle of a manuscript *cancionero*, which contains four works in verse by the glossator. Held at the

Biblioteca Nacional (MSS/10177 [*Cancionero que contiene*]), this manuscript interrogates the relationship between authorship and book production, and the process of textual adaptation. Dated 1564, the manuscript contains copies of Aranda's *glosas* on Santillana and Mena that were published eleven years later in Granada, in 1575. Like the 1575 edition of those *glosas*, this manuscript establishes a connection between authorship and the codicological entity; it brings together four works of textual adaptation (a *contrafacción* on Mena's *Laberinto*, the two verse *glosas* on Mena and Santillana, along with a morally instructive poem on human virtue, based on well-known *exempla*, called the *Ejemplario de virtudes*), all organized around the name of the author, which is highlighted on the title page of the manuscript:

En este *volumen o cancionero* se contienen quatro obras de prouechosa doctrina y erudición. La primera es una traslación a la primera horden de la luna que compuso el famoso poeta castellano Juan de mena. La segunda, una glosa dicha extrauagante a çiertas coplas de las más notables de las trezientas del susodicho. La tercera, una obra intitulada exemplario de virtudes. La quarta y última, otra glosa a los çinquenta prouerbios de los ciento que compuso el marquês de Santillana, *las quales obras son compuestas por Luis de aranda, vezino de la Çibdad de Úbeda.* (my italics)

Copied in what appears to be the hand of a calligrapher, the manuscript can be read as an attempt to materialize Aranda's authorship of the works it contains. Its copyist understands both the book ("este volumen o cancionero") and the works of textual adaptation that it contains as authorial, and authoritative, products. In this way, the figure of the glossator is elevated to the status of author.

However, as the title page of the Aranda manuscript acknowledges, Aranda is not the only author of and in the book. The early modern association between authorship and a single, codicological entity, identified by Chartier, is complicated by the fact that the *glosa* is both authored by, and "authors" (or canonizes), two poets. Chartier, elaborating on the importance of the "book form" as a way of "materializing authorship," observes in an essay coauthored with Peter Stallybrass that "[o]ne way of defining an author is as someone who is bound with him or herself. Such binding of oneself with oneself was only occasionally negotiated by a living author in Medieval and

Renaissance Europe” (195).¹⁰ These observations encourage us to consider two important aspects of the *glosa*. Firstly, the glossator is never bound solely with himself, but rather with the poets that he glosses. In the manuscript *cancionero*, Aranda is bound with Santillana and “el famoso poeta castellano Juan de Mena.” This manuscript compilation of Aranda’s rewritings of authoritative texts thus stages authorship as a weaving together of texts, of voices, of author-figures. For Aranda, as for the compiler of this manuscript *cancionero*, the process of authorship comprises the process of textual adaptation.

This continuity between textual adaptation and authorship is written into the rubrics of Aranda’s manuscript *contrafacción*, which begin by describing Aranda as the *traslator* of the text, and in *Copla 2* use the term *autor* instead. This slippage suggests fluidity in the understanding of the two terms; the process of textual adaption starts to break down traditional definitions of authorship. We might compare this fluidity with the medieval scholastic approach to separating modes of textual adaptation from those of authorship, the most famous example of which is, perhaps, St. Bonaventure’s oft-quoted account of the four ways of making a book:

The method of making a book is fourfold. For someone writes the materials of others, adding or changing nothing, and this person is said to be merely the scribe. Someone else writes the materials of others, adding, but nothing of his own, and this person is said to be the compiler. Someone else writes both the materials of other men, and his own, but the materials of others as the principal materials, and his own annexed for the purpose of clarifying them, and this person is said to be the commentator, not the author. Someone else writes both his own materials and those of others, but his own as the principal materials, and the materials of others annexed for the purpose of confirming his own, and such must be called the author. (qtd. in Minnis 94)

Both the manuscript *cancionero* and the 1575 *Glosa intitulada segunda* materialize the authorship of the glossator in a way that does not map directly

10. For a broad overview of medieval and early modern concepts of authorship see Andrew Bennett (38–54).

onto Bonaventure's scheme, but rather blurs these distinctions, asking us to reconsider how authorship was understood in the context of sixteenth-century literary production. In organizing the textual adaptations that they contain around the name of Luis de Aranda, both the manuscript and the printed book establish a relationship between the creation of a codicological entity and the notion of Aranda as an author. However, both also demonstrate that the early modern author can never truly be "bound with himself"; he is inevitably bound with other authorial names and works, and he is as contingent upon them as they are on him.¹¹

This brings us to the second aspect of the *glosa* that becomes apparent in the light of Chartier and Stallybrass's observations about the book: the *glosa* is a process by which the glossed medieval poets are canonized, cemented as *auctores*, and renewed for Renaissance readers. The materialization of authorship in the form of a book was "only occasionally negotiated by a living author in Medieval and Renaissance Europe": in the case of Petrarch's *I Trionfi*, argue Chartier and Stallybrass, "the material 'authoring' of Petrarch as a canonical figure was as much the work of readers, editors, and booksellers after his death as of his own literary project" (195). Similarly, the Renaissance conversion of Manrique's *Coplas* into a book was not the poet's own literary project, but was rather brought about by the dynamic engagement of the poem's Renaissance glossators, printers, and readers. Aranda recognized the importance of the *glosa* in this process. He was aware that in "guarnescer y adornar el brocado de tres altos" (*Glosa intitulada segunda* fol. 35^v), he was in fact "authoring" these late medieval poets as much as himself, securing their literary *fama* as well as his.

The 1575 *Glosa intitulada segunda* is a commentary on not just the verse of Mena and Santillana, but also on the process of their canonization, of their renewal through the *glosa* and through the medium of print for sixteenth-century readers. The book also draws attention to the importance of the role of the glossator and the reader in this process; it centers around the activity of these figures, rather than the author. This is most evident in the structure of the book, which mirrors that of a commonplace book: Aranda radically reorders Mena's *Trescientas*, selecting only twenty-four stanzas out of the

11. This is true of prose authors, too; the Renaissance saw the publication of many narrative "sequels," for which see William Hinrichs. Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor* (1492) was printed with its 1496 continuation by Nicolás Núñez throughout the sixteenth century; I have discussed the implications of this elsewhere ("Continuation").

original three hundred, with clear moral-didactic messages. These are re-ordered to form what might be described as a wisdom manual, to parallel the other medieval text in the volume, Santillana's *Proverbios*:

Coplas 1–3: On truth, justice and injustice

Copla 4: On the importance of prudence

Copla 5: On strength and bravery

Copla 6: On the order of the Heavens

Coplas 7–9: On avarice and the misery that money brings

Copla 10: On the vagaries of Fortune

Coplas 11–13: On the virtues of poverty and incorruptibility

Coplas 14–21: Negative exempla of women who betrayed their husbands; on the dangers of *loco amor*

Copla 22: On the transience of earthly achievements

Copla 23: On the type of reader who will correctly understand the text

Copla 24: Conclusion: Author-glossator expresses his fatigue and the work comes to a close

Whereas Hernán Núñez de Toledo's expansive prose gloss was designed to open up the complex and obscure allegorical poem to a wider audience—he imagines the commentary as an “amphitheatro abierto y claro donde todos, assí doctos como indoctos, puedan sin miedo ninguno entrar” (181)—Aranda opens up some of the possible meanings of the text for the reader by paradoxically narrowing the poem down. He distills it down to the stanzas that he considers to be the most morally instructive. In so radically abridging and restructuring Mena, Aranda's *Glosa intitulada segunda* draws attention to the central role of the *glossator*, and also to the printed form of the *glosa* in mediating the Renaissance reader's experience of the two medieval texts, and in renewing them for a new audience. The restructuring of these two *auctores* stages the process of their renewal and canonization through the work of the glossator, and his printers.

The edition also points to the role of the reader in continuing this process of renewal. Aranda's *glosa* on Mena, alongside his abridged version of the *Proverbios*, of which he only glosses around half of the original one hundred stanzas, also offers the Renaissance reader not only a new text, but also an entirely new material platform from which to engage with the *Laberinto*. He brings together excerpts from the poems, organized by theme, which the reader can take, digest, and put to practical use, and thus offers Renaissance

readers an alternative way of accessing these classic texts rather than through the lengthy prose commentaries of Pero Díaz de Toledo and Núñez. Aranda's *glosa* stages a particular type of early modern reading practice, which reflects the sixteenth-century reader's desire to read with a specific purpose in mind: to mine for *sententiae*. Like the commonplace book, Aranda's *glosa* presents a particular reading and curation of authoritative texts, but this reading awaits the continuation of the reader, who will make his/her own use of the authoritative excerpts that have been collected for, and presented to, him/her. In this sense, the *Glosa intitulada segunda* stages the continuity between the *glosa* as a "finished," printed product bought by readers, and as the mere beginning of a creative process, which will be continued by these readers, and through which the medieval *cancionero* poets remain alive in cultural memory.

Like the 1575 *Glosa intitulada segunda*, the 1564 manuscript *cancionero* of Aranda's works also interrogates the role of the textual adapter in the process of canonizing the medieval *auctor*. The role of the adapter in "translating" the poetry of the past for the present is the focus of Aranda's *contrafacción* of the First Order of the Moon of Mena's *Laberinto de Fortuna*, the opening work of the *cancionero*. In the rubrics of the *contrafacción*, Aranda is, as we have seen, cast initially as the *traslator* of Mena's *Laberinto*: "Comiença la traslación Del famoso y muy eçelente poeta Juan de Mena y así como él en su copla primera Dirige su obra al rrey Don Juan así el *traslator* Dirige y aplica esta primera suya al todo poderoso y verdadero Rey y señor universal De todos los siglos y rredentor nuestro Jesu Christo" (fol. 1^r; my italics). Each *a lo divino* stanza of the *Laberinto* is preceded by a prose summary, which lays bare the process of the *contrafacción*; it states what Aranda is doing to the meaning of Mena's verse. The rubric above describes Aranda's redirection to God of Mena's dedication to King John II. Aranda does not just change Mena's meaning, he also writes himself making that change. This continues throughout the text; subsequent summaries continue to draw attention to the differences or similarities between the meaning of model text and its adaptation, for example: "Copla viii. en la qual el autor auisa al cristiano y deuoto letor se guarde de los siete pecados mortales, los quales señala *a diferencia y en lugar* de las siete pleyadas que Juan de mena pone en la suya" (fol. 3^r; my italics). As Francisco Javier Sánchez Martínez observes, the *contrafacción* operates precisely in the tensions and concordances between the source text and its *a lo divino* version, forming a dialectical process:

Todo el proceso transformatorio del sentido que opera el contrafactor en cuanto traductor “a divino”, gira en torno a un sistema de identidades, analogías y discrepancias entre el argumento de la obra profana y el de su versión sacra . . . Es en esta dialéctica fricción entre lo analógico y lo disímil como se deriva el sentido divinizador. (396–97)

In this dialectical process, the *traslator* moves between the original site of textual authority and the site of new meanings he creates. The textual adapter mediates between the texts of the past and the present. In doing so, he renews them for a new audience, and participates in their canonization.

“*Es el glosar angosto postigo*”: *The Ambiguities of the Glosa*

The processes in which the *glosa* participates are by no means unambiguous, however, and Aranda comments explicitly on their tensions in the prologues to his printed *glosas* on Manrique (1552) and Santillana and Mena (1575), as well as in the *glosas* themselves. Aranda is particularly concerned with the ambiguities of his relationship with his literary predecessors, and the tension between his nostalgia for the poetry of the past on the one hand, and his desire to equal or surpass the *auctores* on the other.

Over fifty years ago José Manuel Blecua pointed to the parallel *corrientes* of Golden Age literary production, to the endurance of the traditional, Castilian octosyllabic verse on the one hand, and the interest in the new Italianate verse on the other: “Está, pues, bien claro que ese esquematismo de nuestros manuales no responde ni siquiera a una pretendida ventaja didáctica y que la presencia de Castillejo significa muy poco al lado de las otras fuerzas que corren paralelas al endecasílabo” (24). Castillejo’s significance as an emblem of the rift between the old and new poetic forms has, of course, continued to be reevaluated by scholars including Rogelio Reyes Cano, for whom Castillejo was more concerned with evoking an authoritative Castilian literary tradition than opposing the innovations of the Italianate poets. The sixteenth century was a period in which writers both looked to the past for poetic models and created new ones, and Aranda, like Castillejo, was concerned with the construction of a Castilian canon based on the *cancionero* poets of the fifteenth century, which he sets out in his 1575 prologue:

Quatro personas calificadas fueron las que más notablemente se señalaron y aumentaron en escriuir y componer coplas y metros en nuestra lengua

materna Castellana, en el tiempo que esta habilidad fue tenuta y estimada por cosa de mucha discreción y gentileza (conviene à saber) Juan de Mena, García Sánchez de Badajoz, don George Manrique, y don Yñigo López de Mendoça (Marqués que fue de Sanctillana) de lo qual dan claro y verdadero testimonio las obras dignas de memoria que a diversos propósitos y diferentes materiàs dexaron escriptas. (fol. 35^r)

In his earlier (1552) prologue to his commentary on Manrique's *Coplas*, however, Aranda had bemoaned the Renaissance poet's struggle to step out of the shadows of the great *auctores* of the past; they have already said everything new and worth saying, he argued, and have left the new generation of poets scrambling for new ways of reworking their wise words:

Porque aunque vengamos a consentir, que los ingenios y habilidades presentes exceden a los passados, no les podemos negar, auer nascido antes que nosotros, y auernos ganado por la mano, y auer sido primeros inventores, y auer dicho primeramente todo lo bueno, *de manera que los verdaderos auctores son los passados, porque los presentes otra cosa no son, sino representantes y recitadores de cosas passadas*, y assí verá vuestra merced, que todos andamos a caça (como dizen) de grillos, unos alargando lo corto, otros abreuando lo largo, unos aclarando lo escuro, otros oscureciendo lo claro. (fol. 2^r; my italics)

Aranda expresses here a Bloomian anxiety of influence—the inability to equal or surpass his predecessors—and appears exasperated at the limited possibility of originality available in the processes of glossing and adaptation. But his words are also a wry comment on the inevitability of intertextuality in early modern literary culture. His comments here suggest a keen awareness that writing encompasses the process of rewriting past texts through acts of memory, translation, continuation, rewriting, and glossing, as Weiss (“Memory in Creation”) and Carruthers have described. For Aranda, a truly “independent” text that does not rehearse, in some way, past texts is an illusion.

Aranda sees the *glosa* as a way of entering into dialogue with his medieval predecessors that transcends the temporal and canonical distance between them. For him, the *glosa* is a highly skilled branch of poetry, due to its complex demands on the glossator:

Entre las otras cosas de mucha habilidad y primor, la que mayor de todas me parece es el glosar, por las muchas cosas à que se deue tener respecto y atención . . . La primera que se debe guardar con mucho auiso y cuydado, la sentencia del texto que uamos glosando. La segunda, que deuemos caminar forçosamente por los mesmos consonantes, de lo que se pretende glosar. Y la tercera, que han de uenir tan uniformes los pies modernos de la glosa con los antiguos del texto, *que parezca que los unos nascieron para glosar, y los otros para ser glosados*. Y quando estas tres cosas se obseruan y guardan como deuen, uiene à ser la glosa perfecta y honrradora de su Auctor. (*Glosa de Moral sentido* fols. 4^{r-v}; my italics)

The aim of the *glosa*, according to Aranda, is not to simply produce a rewriting or an adaptation of the text, but rather to weave another *part* of that text in a way that would transcend its plural authorship: “que parezca que los unos nascieron para glosar, y los otros para ser glosados.” In this way, Aranda imagines the *glosa* as a dialogic process, which pulls the medieval text into the present. For it is through this process that a text becomes a “classic,” as Weiss observes: “a ‘classic’ requires a humanist subject position, whereby the reader is encouraged to move across time, to set the past in dialogue with the present” (“Between the Censor” 95).

But although the formal demands of the *glosa* present a unique challenge to the glossator’s ingenuity and an opportunity to demonstrate his poetic prowess, these very requirements are also constraints on the glossator’s creativity. In a highly metapoetical passage of his *glosa* on the *Laberinto*, Aranda breaks away from Mena’s voice in order to complain of these creative limitations:

No miren los sabios las cosas que digo,
Sino las que quiero y no sé decir,
Porque es *el glosar angosto postigo*,
Y los consonantes que en la glosa sigo,
Son los que me haze[n] el texto seguir,
Assí que caminan con mil ocasiones,
Mis coplas que al hilo de las viejas reman,
Y van muy subjectas a sus condiciones. (fol. 33^r; my italics)

Aranda’s *glosa* self-consciously draws attention to itself here, to the labor of the glossator, who is bound by the rhyme scheme and subject matter of the

text. For Aranda, it is impossible for the glossator to express what he would like to when his words must be so closely tethered to those of the text that he glosses.

Another paradox in the process of glossing presents itself in subsequent stanzas: Aranda confesses that although the glossed text constrains the creative endeavors of the glossator, it also remains out of his reach; it is impossible for the glossator to ever approximate either the meaning or the grandeur of his model text. New and different meanings are inevitably produced, as illustrated by the Renaissance *glosas* on Manrique's *Coplas*, many of which reinterpret the poem entirely. Aranda dramatizes the glossator's struggle to do justice to the original in the final stanza of his *glosa* on the *Laberinto*, which takes up Mena's metaphor of the "barquilla":

La flaca barquilla es mi flaca pluma,
Que va nauegando por este glosar,
Y quiero primero que aquesta se suma,
Que aquesta se suma o que me consuma,
La playa o los puertos seguros tomar,
Porque à las trezientas no bastan trezientos
Ni mil trovadores su libro glosalle . . .
Con el gouernalle cansósse temprano,
Por ser tan profundo este laberinto,
Que pie no le halla mi trémula mano,
Y assí lo mejor será y los más sano,
Que haga aquí fin l[a] glosa que pinto. (fols. 34^{r-v})

Despite this image of the glossator, dwarfed by the complex and expansive topography of Mena's labyrinth ("por ser tan profundo este laberinto"), Aranda's final line here returns to the product that he has created: "la glosa que pinto," which has, in fact, radically abridged and restructured Mena's text, and turned it into something quite different. The glossator has not been defeated by his model after all; despite Aranda's closing words, his *glosa* has instead reformulated the traditional hierarchical relationship between glossator and *auctor*.

Through his often paradoxical observations about the *glosa*, then, Aranda exposes the ambiguities and tensions of the process of glossing. The *glosa* is

predicated here upon the temporal and authoritative distance between glossator and *auctor*, but is also the means of breaching this divide. It is a restrictive form, but it therefore offers the glossator a uniquely creative challenge, and ultimately, a way to become an author himself.

The Reader Takes Up the Thread of the Glosa

Before concluding, I will turn briefly to the readers of these Renaissance *glosas*, and highlight some questions that demand further research in this area: does the increased visibility of the glossator in sixteenth-century poetic and book production tell us anything about a reader who is more engaged with the creative (rather than hermeneutic) process of reading? Why were these *glosas* so popular among readers? Edward Wilson-Lee has argued that the increased presence of textual commentaries in early modern European printed books was to an extent symptomatic of sixteenth-century concerns regarding the unmediated reading of texts, which were being reproduced rapidly through print: “Both the humanist and the Protestant visions of an unmediated communion between reader and text are replaced, from the late 1520s on, with a more cautious approach: pleasure is to be guided to usefulness by learning, as faith is to be guided to salvation by learning” (148).¹² There is, however, evidence that the popularity of commentaries and glosses in sixteenth-century print culture was not solely the result of institutional pressures and that Renaissance readers were, in fact, active participants in developing their use. Where the verse *glosa* is concerned, there is evidence that Renaissance readers wanted to read classic works of *cancionero* verse through the mediation of not just one interpretive voice, but many. It appears that sixteenth-century readers were interested in reading, and having in their possession, multiple *glosas* on the *Coplas*. The only extant copy of the 1576 edition of Montemayor’s second *glosa* on the *Coplas*, held at the Hispanic Society of America, contains a manuscript copy of Rodrigo de Valdepeñas’s *glosa* in its margins. In turn, a copy of the 1581 edition of Valdepeñas’s *glosa*, held at the Biblioteca Nacional (R/2857), is bound with a

12. See also Iveta Nakládalová’s monograph on learned theories of reading in the early modern period, which examines, inter alia, ideas about the ways in which reading should be controlled, ethically and materially.

manuscript copy of Gonzalo de Figueroa's *glosa*. It would appear that the copyist was most probably the owner or user of the Valdepeñas exemplar, and transcribed from the Figueroa edition, wishing to have a copy of both of these *glosas* on Manrique's *Coplas*.¹³

Further evidence of such readerly activity can be found in a manuscript miscellany held at the library of the Escorial Monastery (RBME &-III-21 ["*Coplas de Jorge Manrique*"]), which contains a copy of Aranda's *glosa* on the *Coplas*, as well as a copy of Valdepeñas's *glosa* on the elegy, copied in what appears to be the same hand.¹⁴ Here, another reader has copied and gathered together two of the glosses on Manrique. Notably, the copy of Aranda's commentary is selective; it contains only twenty-four stanzas. Again, this is evidence of Renaissance readers curating their own readings of these texts; they shape the material and textual form in which they receive this poetry, creating new texts and books in the process, like the glossators themselves. Through the activity of these Renaissance readers, the creative process of rewriting through reading continues. The Renaissance reader continues to weave the "maravilloso tapiz" begun by the glossators of the medieval poets s/he reads, and therefore cannot be omitted from future studies of the *glosa*.

Conclusions

I have sketched out here some possible areas of inquiry into the cultural functions of the Renaissance *glosa*. It is clear following this survey of Aranda's little-studied glosses and their prologues that the sixteenth-century *glosa* on late medieval *cancionero* verse has much to tell us about how Renaissance Spain engaged with its medieval literary traditions, and about the centrality of textual adaptation in early modern literary culture. The Renaissance *glosa* and its material transmission, in both print and manuscript, offer new insights into the early modern evolution of the concepts of authorship, creativity, and reading practices.

This is underpinned by two different, but often intertwining, contemporary understandings of the *glosa*: as product and as process. Aranda and his fellow Renaissance glossators were aware that although their *glosas* were

13. See Beltrán (53) for further analysis of this copyist's process.

14. See Julián Zarco Cuevas (298 n16) for a description of this manuscript.

marketed and circulated as material and literary products, particularly through their commodification in print, they were, in fact, merely the beginning of a creative and often ambiguous process through which poets of the past were canonized and new meanings, which these *auctores* could not have foreseen, were produced. There is much work still to be done on this “maravilloso tapiz” woven by medieval poets, Renaissance glossators, printers, and their readers in the sixteenth century. This work will need to approach the *glosa* not as a fixed, authorial product, but rather as a process that produces new texts, new books, new authors, and new ways for Renaissance poets and readers to interact with the printed book and the poetry of the past.

Works cited

- Aranda, Luis de. [*Cancionero que contiene quatro obras de provechosa erudición compuestas por Don Luis de Aranda, vezino de la Çibdad de Úbeda*]. 1564, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid, MSS/10177.
- . [“Coplas de Jorge Manrique, y su Glosa moral por Luis de Aranda, vecino de Úbeda”]. Sixteenth century, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, Madrid, RBME &-III-21, fols. 371^r–423^r.
- . *Glosa de Moral sentido en prosa. A las famosas, y muy excelentes Coplas de don Jorge Manrique . . .* [Francisco Fernández de Córdoba], 1552. Facsimile by Antonio Pérez Gómez, *Glosas a las “Coplas” de Jorge Manrique*, vol. 4, La fonte que mana y corre, 1962.
- . *Glosa intitulada segunda de moral sentido, à diferencia de otra deste nombre, à los muy singulares Prouerbios del Illustre señor don Yñigo López de Mendoza, Marqués de Santillana. Contiénense más en este libro otra glosa à veynte y quatro coplas de las trezientas de Iuan de Mena*. Hugo de Mena, 1575.
- Bennett, Andrew. *The Author*. Routledge, 2004.
- Beltrán, Vicente, editor. *Coplas que hizo Jorge Manrique a la muerte de su padre: edición crítica con un estudio de su transmisión textual*. PPU, 1991.
- Blecua, José Manuel. “Corrientes poéticas en el siglo XVI.” *Sobre poesía de la Edad de Oro*, Gredos, 1970, pp. 11–24. Originally published in *Insula*, vol. 80, 1952.
- Brocato, Linde M. “‘El famosísimo poeta Juan de Mena’: producción y lectura de su obra impresa en el siglo XVI.” *Juan de Mena: de letrado a poeta*, edited by Cristina Moya García, Tamesis, 2015, pp. 187–204.
- . “Publishing Juan de Mena: An Overview of the Editorial Traditions.” *Revista de Cancioneros Impresos y Manuscritos*, vol. 1, 2012, pp. 1–40. DOI: 10.14198/rcim.2012.1.01.
- Carro Carbajal, Eva Belén. “La Glosa peregrina de Luis de Aranda: tradición, intertextualidad y reescritura.” *El texto infinito: tradición y reescritura en la Edad Media y el Renacimiento*. SEMYR, 2014, pp. 341–58.

- Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Cervantes, Alonso de. *Glosa famosísima sobre las coplas de don Jorge Manrique*. Valentin de Fernandes, 1501. Facsimile by Antonio Pérez Gómez, *Glosas a las "Coplas" de Jorge Manrique*, vol. 1, *La fonte que mana y corre*, 1961.
- Chartier, Roger. *The Order of Books*. Polity, 1994.
- Chartier, Roger, and Peter Stallybrass. "What Is a Book?" *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, edited by Neil Fraistat, Cambridge UP, 2013, pp. 188–204.
- Encina, Juan del. "Juan del Encina a un su amigo." *Obras completas*, vol. 2, edited and introduction by Ana María Rambaldo, Espasa-Calpe, 1978, pp. 25–29.
- Guzmán, Francisco de. *Glosa sobre la obra que hizo Don George Manrique a la muerte del Maestre de Santiago don Rodrigo Manrique*. Pedro Compadre and Blas Guidón, 1548. Facsimile by Antonio Pérez Gómez, *Glosas a las "Coplas" de Jorge Manrique*, vol. 2, *La fonte que mana y corre*, 1961.
- Hinrichs, William H. *The Invention of the Sequel: Expanding Prose Fiction in Early Modern Spain*. Tamesis, 2011.
- Janner, Hans. "La glosa española: estudio histórico de su métrica y de sus temas." *Revista de Filología Española*, vol. 27, 1943, pp. 181–232.
- . "Nuevos criterios para editar glosas." *La edición de textos: Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas del Siglo de Oro*. Tamesis, 1990.
- Labrador Herraiz, José J., and Ralph A. DiFranco. "Continuidad de la poesía del XV en cancioneros del XVI." *Juan Alfonso de Baena y su cancionero. Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre el "Cancionero de Baena" (Baena, del 16 al 20 de febrero de 1999)*, edited by Jesús Serrano Reyes and Juan Fernández Jiménez, Ayuntamiento de Baena-Diputación de Córdoba, 2001, pp. 213–58.
- Marino, Nancy F. *Jorge Manrique's Coplas por la muerte de su padre: A History of the Poem and Its Reception*. Tamesis, 2011.
- Minnis, A. J. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd ed., Scholar Press, 1988.
- Montemayor, Jorge de. *Glosa sobre las coplas de Don Jorge Manrique*. Juan Navarro, 1576. Facsimile by Antonio Pérez Gómez, *Glosas a las "Coplas" de Jorge Manrique*, vol. 2, *La fonte que mana y corre*, 1961.
- Morrás, María. "Fortuna de los Proverbios de Santillana: de la historia del texto a la historia de la recepción." *La escondida senda: estudios en homenaje a Alberto Blecuá*, Castalia, 2012, pp. 39–62.
- Nakládalová, Iveta. *La lectura docta en la Primera Edad Moderna (1450–1650)*. Abada, 2013.
- Nowosiad, Alexandra. "Continuation, Sequel, Gloss: Towards a Reconsideration of Nicolás Núñez's Ending to *Cárcel de amor*." *eHumanista*, vol. 28, 2014, pp. 700–23.
- Nucio, Martín, editor. *Lo que contiene este libro es lo siguiente Prouerbios de don Iñigo López de Mendoza . . .* Martín Nucio, 1551.
- Núñez de Toledo, Hernán. *Glosa sobre las "Trezientas" del famoso poeta Juan de Mena*. Edited by Julian Weiss and Antonio Cortijo Ocaña, Polifemo, 2015.

- Pérez, Luis. *Glosa famosa sobre las coplas de Jorge Manrique*. Sebastián Martínez, 1561. Facsimile by Antonio Pérez Gómez, *Glosas a las “Coplas” de Jorge Manrique*, vol. 3, La fonte que mana y corre, 1962.
- Pérez Gómez, Antonio. “Noticias bibliográficas.” *Glosas a las Coplas de Jorge Manrique*, vol. 6, La fonte que mana y corre, 1963.
- Piacentini, Giuliana, and Blanca Perrián. *Glosas de romances viejos: siglo XVI*. Edizioni ETS, 2002.
- Reyes Cano, Rogelio. “Algunos aspectos de la relación de Cristóbal de Castillejo con la literatura italiana.” *Homenaje a Ángel Chiclana Cardona*, special issue of *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana*, vol. 1, 2000, pp. 211–24.
- Rodríguez-Velasco, Jesús D. “La *Bibliotheca* y los márgenes: ensayo teórico sobre la glosa en el ámbito cortesano del siglo XV en Castilla, I: código, dialéctica y autoridad.” *eHumanista*, vol. 1, 2001, pp. 119–34.
- . *Plebeyos márgenes: ficción, industria del derecho y ciencia literaria, siglos XIII–XIV*. SEMYR, 2011.
- . “La producción del margen.” *La Corónica*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2010, pp. 249–72.
- Ruiz Fuentes, Vicente Miguel. “Sebastián de Córdoba Sacedo y Luis de Aranda: aproximación biográfica a dos poetas ubetenses del siglo XVI.” *Actas de las II y III Jornadas de Humanismo y Renacimiento: Úbeda, septiembre 93 y mayo 94*, 1996, UNED, 1996, pp. 101–14.
- Sánchez Arce, Nellie E. *Las Glosas a las “Coplas” de Jorge Manrique*. Sancha, 1956.
- Sánchez Martínez, Francisco Javier. “La contrafacción ‘a lo divino’ del *Laberinto de Fortuna* o *Las Trescientas*, de Juan de Mena, por el ubetense Luis de Aranda.” *Historia y crítica de la poesía lírica culta “a lo divino” en la España del siglo de oro*, vol. 5.2, Francisco Javier Sánchez Martínez, 2011, pp. 357–403.
- Scoles, Emma, and Ines Ravasini. “Intertestualità e interpretazione nel genere lirico della ‘glosa.’” *Nunca fue pena mayor: estudios de literatura española en homenaje a Brian Dutton*, edited by Victoriano Roncero López and Ana Menéndez Collera, U de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996, pp. 615–31.
- Tomassetti, Isabella. *Cantaré según veredes: intertextualidad y construcción poética en el siglo XV*. Iberoamericana–Vervuert, 2017.
- . “La glosa castellana: calas en los orígenes de un género.” *Actas del XIII Congreso Internacional, Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval*, edited by José Manuel Fradejas Rueda et al., vol. 2, Ayuntamiento de Valladolid and U de Valladolid, 2010, pp. 1729–45.
- Valdepeñas, Rodrigo de. *Glosa religiosa y muy christiana sobre las coplas de Don George Manrique*. Juan de Brocar, [1540]. Facsimile by Antonio Pérez Gómez, *Glosas a las “Coplas” de Jorge Manrique*, vol. 1, La fonte que mana y corre, 1961.
- Wilson-Lee, Edward. “Glosses and Oracles: Translating the Reader in Early Modern Europe.” *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Edward Wilson-Lee and José María Pérez Fernández, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 145–63.
- Weiss, Julian. “Between the Censor and the Critic: Reading the Vernacular Classic in Early Modern Spain.” *Reading and Censorship in Early Modern Europe*, edited by María

José Vega, Julian Weiss, and Cesc Esteve, U Autònoma de Barcelona, 2010, pp. 93–112.
Studia Àurea Monogràfica.

———. “Memory in Creation: The Context of Rojas’s Literary Recollection.” *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 86, no.1, 2009, pp. 150–58.

Zarco Cuevas, Julián. *Catálogo de los manuscritos castellanos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial*, vol. 1, Imprenta Helénica, 1924.